ERIC Document Resume | See Instruction Sheet | DATE OF RESUME 6/30/65 | DATE RECEIVED

A. PUBLICATION DATA

ED000826 | B. ORIGINATING ORG. CONTROL NUMBER: 8332 | C. MICROFICHE NO.

DO NOT WRITE IN SPACE BELOW

4. AUTHOR(S):
Ellis, Robert A. and Kovel, John P.

5. TITLE OF DOCUMENT ABSTRACTED:
Campus Reaction to a Proposed Change in the Time of Fraternity-Sorority Rushing: A Report by the Student Planning Survey for the University of Oregon Office of Student Affairs

6. PUBLICATION TITLE:
N.A.

7. EDITOR(S):
N.A.

8. PLACE OF ORIGIN:
Univ. of Oregon
CITY: Eugene, Oregon
ST.:
CITY, STATE
VOL. | ISSUE | DATE
INSTITUTE CODE

9. PUBLISHED BY SOURCE:
University of Oregon

10. N.A.	11. PAGES: N.A.	12. ORIG. PUB.: Oct. 62	13. TOTAL NO.: 40

MICROFILM COPY AVAILABLE: YES ☒ NO ☐

COPYRIGHT GRANTED: YES ☐ NO ☒

COPYRIGHT RELEASE FILED: YES ☐ NO ☐

TYPE OF REPORT:
PROPOSAL ☐
IN PROGRESS ☐
FINAL ☒
FOLLOW-UP ☐

OTHER ERIC REFERENCES:

ERIC SATELLITE CODE

B. INDEXING DATA

14. SUBJECT AREA

15. TYPE OF ENDEAVOR: survey

16. INDEXING TERMS (4-12):
surveys
students
extracurricular | opinions

17. ABSTRACT (MAX. 200 WORDS):

Results of a survey initiated in the spring of 1962 to determine student opinion on the proposed deferral of fraternity-sorority rushing from orientation week to the spring quarter.

ERIC No.

18. SOURCE OF ABSTRACT

C. FUNDING DATA

19. SUPPORTING ORGANIZATION

20. DIVISION OR DEPT.

22. TOTAL COST OF PROJECT

23. DURATION OF PROJECT

21. CONTRACT NO.

PROJECT NO.

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
Office of Education

ERIC Form 1

R-1-1

3932

(Includes Statistical Supplement To The Report)

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
Office of Education

This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated do not necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

CAMPUS REACTION TO A PROPOSED CHANGE IN THE TIME OF FRATERNITY-SORORITY RUSHING:

A REPORT BY THE STUDENT PLANNING SURVEY FOR THE UNIVERSITY OF OREGON OFFICE OF STUDENT AFFAIRS

by

Robert A. Ellis and John P. Koval

October 1962

ED000826

CAMPUS REACTION TO A PROPOSED CHANGE IN THE TIMING OF FRATERNITY AND SORORITY RUSHING

While much serious thought has, in recent years, been given to the possibility of rescheduling fraternity and sorority rushing from New Student Week to spring quarter, little is yet known about how students and other members of the University community might react to such a change. At the request of President Fleming and the Office of Student Affairs, a survey was initiated in the spring of 1961 to find out whether the prevailing mood on campus would be for or against a system of deferred rushing.

METHOD

Sampling Procedure

The research was carried out in conjunction with a survey of University of Oregon undergraduates already being undertaken to evaluate the impact of the Honors College program. This permitted incorporating questions regarding students' reaction to rushing in a larger questionnaire scheduled to be administered to members of the freshman class in the spring of 1962. Having the items on rushing represent only a small part of the total number asked served to make less blatant their purpose and, thus, to reduce the risk of student resistance to being questioned on an issue as potentially sensitive as this one. Another advantage to linking the present study with the Honors College inquiry was the ready availability of a carefully drawn probability sample of all entering freshmen. At registration, when the Honors College study was first initiated, this random sample of the entire freshman class numbered 404 students and still contained 342 in attendance at the time of the administration of the spring questionnaire. The availability of such an intact sample provided at a minimum of cost in time and money a basis for generalizing findings to the total freshman population, the group most recently having a firsthand experience with rushing. In addition to a probability sample of freshmen, there was also available a separately drawn sample of all newly entering freshmen in the Honors College. The latter, totalling 142 in number, provided a means for ascertaining how the more intellectually committed among undergraduates would react to the plan for deferred rushing. Still a third advantage stemmed from the fact that in two previous questionnaire periods a large body of demographic and attitudinal data had been already collected which would facilitate a more refined analysis of freshman opinion on rushing.

The major disadvantage to relying on the Honors College study as a vehicle for collecting data was the restriction of its samples to just freshmen in the University. This disadvantage was partially offset by adding special samples of persons recognized as opinion leaders on campus. Among those added were: incoming and outgoing members of the ASUO senate, members of the Interfraternity and Panhellenic Councils, and male and

...undergraduate opinion on campus.

The interest adults connected with the University have in fraternity and sorority affairs, as well as the influence they can bring to bear, dictated an effort also be made to gain some measure of the attitudes held by this sector of the University community. For this reason the sample design was expanded to include three additional sample components: officers over the past three years of the University of Oregon Mothers and Dads Clubs; alumni "leaders" (graduates selected on the basis of their particular interest in the development and welfare of the University and fraternity and sorority chapter advisors.

These samples were drawn from three generically distinct populations: freshmen at the University of Oregon, including a special sample of those in the Honors College; undergraduate opinion leaders; and adults influential in campus affairs. Table 1 presents a breakdown of these populations by sample component, the number of subjects in each component from whom data were collected, and the percentage of completed questionnaires returned for each component. It can be readily seen that sampling of the two student populations was extremely effective. The completed questionnaires never amounted to less than 86 per cent of the total possible and for some components the figure ranged as high as 98 per cent. The situation is quite different for University-connected adults, where, because of the practical necessity of relying on mailed questionnaires rather than direct contact, there was a far less efficient canvassing of opinion. The fact that for most of these components around 50 per cent of the adults contacted failed to return their questionnaires indicates the need for some caution in the conclusions drawn from the findings on this sector of the University community.

Collection of Data

From structured questionnaires administered in the spring quarter of 1962, three types of information were gathered on rushing. All respondents were first given the task of registering their reaction to a proposal for "changing fraternity and sorority rushing from New Student Week to another time" by indicating whether they thought such a proposed change would be (a) a very good idea, (b) a good idea, (c) a poor idea, (d) a very poor idea, or (e) don't care one way or the other.

This initial question was then followed by two alternative probes. Those respondents who considered altering present rushing arrangements a poor or very poor idea were asked to indicate their reasons for thinking so. Those respondents who, on the other hand, considered changing the time of rushing to be a good or very good idea were asked to specify the time in the academic year they preferred rushing should be held. There were four choices provided: (a) during the summer before college begins,

TABLE 1 SAMPLE CONTINUITY ACHIEVED

Sample Component	Number of Completed Questionnaires	Per Cent of Completed Questionnaires
FRESHMEN		
Random Sample of all Freshmen	336	95
Honors College Freshmen	240	89
UNDERGRADUATE OPINION LEADERS		
ASUO Senate: 1961-1962	28	97
ASUO Senate: 1962-1963	23	96
Interfraternity Council	69	86
Panhellenic Council	58	91
Dormitory Counsellors: Male	24	86
Dormitory Counsellors: Female	31	100
UNIVERSITY-CONNECTED ADULTS		
Fraternity Chapter Advisors	11	55
Sorority Chapter Advisors	15	94
Officers of Dads Club	37	48
Officers of Mothers Club	50	53
Alumni Leaders	30	40

(b) later in the fall quarter, (c) winter quarter, and (d) spring quarter. Respondents also had the option of writing in a time period of their own choice if they found none of the alternatives suitable. No probing questions were asked of persons whose answers indicated they did not care one way or the other about the issue of rushing.

These questions, as a unit, were included as part of a larger set eliciting student opinion on nine current campus issues. This was done to make the purpose of the present inquiry a little less conspicuous and to provide a comparative base for gauging the strength of the reaction to rushing relative to other issues of interest on campus. The statements used for describing the nine issues are listed below in their order of presentation in the questionnaire. For convenient reference, an abbreviated title for each issue is given in the left-hand column. (See Appendix 1 for a copy of the questionnaire.)

TITLE	CAMPUS ISSUE
1. Auditorium	1. Having the University and city jointly build a new auditorium.
2. Admissions Standards	2. Raising admissions standards for incoming freshmen.
3. Academic Freedom	3. Modifying University policy so as to prevent avowed Communists from using the campus as a public forum
4. Size of Honors College	4. Expanding the size of the Honors College so that more students can participate.
5. Parking Fees	5. Increasing parking fees from the present rate of $5 a year so as to provide more parking space.
6. Football Stadium	6. Using present student activity fees to finance a new and larger football stadium.
7. Tri-Semester System	7. Changing the academic year to 4 full quarters so that a person could graduate in three years.
8. Rushing	8. Changing fraternity and sorority rushing from New Student Week to another time.
9. Quarter System	9. Changing from a quarter system to a semester system.

REACTION OF FRESHMEN

That the prevailing sentiment among freshmen strongly favors changing the time of rushing is clearly evidenced by the results tabulated below. Table 2 shows that from 60 to 72 per cent of those surveyed think such a change to be a good or very good idea. As impressive as these statistics may be, the size of the actual majority obtained is obscured by the sizeable segment of students reportedly not caring one way or the other about this issue. With the exception of the proposal to levy an increase in parking fees, to which almost half the freshmen give a "don't know" response, there is no other single issue where such widespread apathy is found. When analysis is limited to only those persons taking a definite stand pro or con on the issue of rushing, as has been done in Table 3, a truer picture is gained of the clear, decisive plurality supporting change--with about five to seven times the number of students being for change as are opposed to it.

The students who oppose changing present rushing arrangements do so for a wide variety of reasons, their arguments running the gamut from the thesis that deferred rushing would hurt "the Greek system" to the thesis that rushing, no matter how it is handled, is a tension-producing episode in the life of the student which you might just as well get out of the way as soon as possible. The one and only common thread to these arguments is the concern of the students that deferred rushing would unduly disrupt their studies or in some other way conflict with their college activities. This point is raised by 40 per cent of the freshmen in the random sample opposing change and by 31 per cent of the freshmen in the Honors College opposing change.

The findings in Table 4 give some indication of the time freshmen deem to be the most suitable for the rescheduling of rush week. The results show the great majority, regardless of sex or sample component, advocate some form of deferred rushing--but not the deferral to the spring quarter presently contemplated by the administration. Support for the latter program is given by only a few students. Instead, the dominant sentiment is for scheduling rush week later in the fall, with the winter quarter being a second choice. There are some who advocate a system of early rushing, but the number doing so is relatively insignificant. Thus, while freshmen do not specifically advocate a deferral of rushing to the spring quarter, the weight of evidence suggests they would be receptive to a change in this direction.

From these data, we also can gain a partial answer to the question of what bearing fraternity (or sorority) affiliation may have on the stand students take on the issue of rushing. Here, the analysis will be confined to only the random sample, with the cross section it provides of fraternity and sorority members and of independents in the freshman class. According to the sample, 39 per cent of freshman women and 45 per cent of freshman men become members of a sorority or a fraternity by the end of their first year in college. At first glance, these figures seem

TABLE 2. REACTION OF FRESHMEN TO PROPOSAL TO CHANGE TIME OF MEETING

Sample Component	N	Per Cent Responding: Very Good	Good	Poor	Very Poor	Don't Care	No Answer or Don't Know
Sample Of All Freshmen							
Males	156	29	30	04	09	29	00
Females	180	54	18	06	04	18	00
Honors College Freshmen							
Males	66	35	32	03	06	22	00
Females	74	42	22	00	04	24	00

TABLE 3. REACTION OF FRESHMEN TO PROPOSAL TO CHANGE TIME OF MEETING, WITH APATHETIC STUDENTS EXCLUDED FROM ANALYSIS

Sample Component	N	Per Cent Responding: Very Good	Good + Very Good	Plurality[a]
Sample Of All Freshmen				
Males	111	41	84	Pro: 5.2/1
Females	148	66	88	Pro: 7.2/1
Honors College Freshmen				
Males	51	43	86	Pro: 6.1/1
Females	56	55	84	Pro: 5.2/1

[a]Plurality is defined as the ratio of majority opinion to minority opinion found among students taking a definite stand on an issue.

TABLE 4. TIME FOR SCHEDULING OF HOUSING PREFERRED BY PERSONS IN FAVOR OF CHANGING HOUSING ARRANGEMENTS

(Reported in Percentages)

Sample Component	N	Period Proposed for Housing					
		Before New Student Week	Later in Fall Quarter	Winter Quarter	Spring Quarter	Other Time	No Answer or Don't Know
Sample Of All Freshmen							
Males	93	05	51	24	14	04	02
Females	130	08	52	24	08	07	01
Monmouth College Freshmen							
Males	44	02	52	34	02	05	05
Females	43	05	44	35	05	00	05

considerably higher, being considerably greater than the general 25 per cent figures reported by the administration. The reason for this discrepancy is that official estimates are based on the results of fall formal rush. They, therefore, exclude from their count (1) freshmen who pledge during the subsequent periods of open rush and (2) freshmen, apparently relatively few in number, who are "pocket pledges" and, thus, for one reason or another keep their affiliation secret. When allowance is made for these considerations, plus perhaps some administrative error in recording, then, as Table 5 shows, the sample's figures on "affiliation" do not depart much from the 25 per cent figure released by the University.

Having established the credibility of the sample statistics, we can now turn to the question at hand. Tables 6-8 present data comparing the attitudes of "affiliates" and independents on the issue of rushing. It can be seen that among rank and file members--at least so far as freshmen are concerned--there is firm support for changing present rushing arrangements, though the pluralities found are more moderate than those found for freshmen in general. Moreover, fraternity and sorority members, alike, express themselves in favor of some form of deferred rushing, their main preference being late fall or winter quarter rather than spring quarter.

Among independents a somewhat more complicated pattern of responses emerges. Examination of Table 6 indicates that a large segment of independents declare themselves not to be concerned one way or the other about this issue. Not unexpectedly, this apathy is from two to three times more prevalent among independents than among fraternity and sorority members. But as Table 7 shows, those independents who bother to take a stand on rushing come out overwhelmingly in favor of altering the present system--the pluralities here in favor of change being eleven to one and fifteen to one for males and females, respectively.

The reason why such a preponderant majority of independents advocate change becomes more apparent when their outlook on fraternity and sorority membership at the time of entering college is examined. Forty-seven per cent of this group of independents reported at the time of fall registration that they clearly expected to join a fraternity or sorority, a figure that is significantly higher than the 17 per cent obtained for independents apathetic on the issue of rushing. Moreover, this same group was much less likely to view such membership as an unimportant aspect of college life. Only 36 per cent of independents taking a stand on the issue of rushing, compared to 56 per cent of the independents who were apathetic on this issue, reported that they considered fraternity and sorority membership unimportant. These findings suggest that student support for the proposal to alter rushing regulations is importantly tied to their own experiences with the present system and, particularly, to the rebuffs they may have personally encountered. The strongest support comes from those freshmen who at matriculation were interested in joining a fraternity or sorority, but who were, for one reason or another, rebuffed in their efforts to do so.

TABLE 3. DISTRIBUTION OF PLEDGES ACCORDING TO SEX BY RANDOM SAMPLE OF FRESHMEN

(Reported in Percentages)

	N	Not Pledged	Time of Pledging				
			Fall Formal Rush[a]	Fall Open Rush	Winter Open Rush	Spring Open Rush	Pocket Pledges + Administrative Error
Males	256	56	26	07	03	04	04
Females	230	61	28	03	00.5	06	02

[a]This column only includes freshmen who report having pledged during fall formal rush and who are recorded as having done so by the University.

[b]Pocket pledges are students who report pledging during fall formal rush but are not officially recorded as pledges until a later date.

TABLE 6. COMPARISON OF REACTION BY INDEPENDENTS AND FRATERNITY-SORORITY MEMBERS IN RANDOM SAMPLE TO PROPOSAL TO CHANGE TIME OF EATING

Affiliation of Freshmen	N	Per Cent Responding					
		Very Good	Good	Poor	Very Poor	Don't Care	Don't Know or No Answer
Male Independents	86	27	24	03	01	44	00
Female Independents	109	51	28	04	01	26	00
Fraternity Members	70	33	36	06	14	10	00
Sorority Members	71	58	18	08	10	06	00

TABLE 7. COMPARISON OF REACTION BY INDEPENDENTS AND FRATERNITY-SORORITY MEMBERS IN RANDOM SAMPLE TO PROPOSAL TO CHANGE TIME OF EATING WITH APATHETIC STUDENTS EXCLUDED FROM ANALYSIS

Affiliation of Freshmen	N	Per Cent Responding		
		Very Good	Good + Very Good	Plurality[a]
Male Independents	48	48	92	Pro: 11 0/1
Female Independents	81	63	94	Pro: 15 2/1
Fraternity Members	63	36	78	Pro: 3 5/1
Sorority Members	67	61	81	Pro: 4 2/1

[a]Plurality is defined as the ratio of majority opinion to minority opinion found among students taking a definite stand on an issue.

TABLE 8. COMPARISON OF TIMES FOR SCHEDULING RUSHING PROPOSED BY INDEPENDENTS AND FRATERNITY-SORORITY MEMBERS IN RANDOM SAMPLE IN FAVOR OF CHANGING RUSHING ARRANGEMENTS

(Reported in Percentages)

Affiliation of Freshmen	N	Period Proposed for Rushing					
		Before New Student Week	Later in Fall Quarter	Winter Quarter	Spring Quarter	Other Time	No Answer or Don't Know
Male Independents	44	09	52	20	09	07	02
Female Independents	76	11	49	26	09	04	01
Fraternity Members	49	02	49	27	18	02	02
Sorority Members	54	04	57	20	07	11	00

REACTION OF UNDERGRADUATE OPINION LEADERS

Among undergraduate opinion leaders there is a mixed reaction to the proposal to change the time of rushing. While the proposal receives strong support in some quarters, it receives equally strong opposition in other quarters.

The findings presented in Tables 9-11 show that a program of deferred rushing is widely endorsed by the dormitory counselors and, to a lesser degree, by the ASUO Senate. But unlike the freshman population, these two groups consider winter and spring quarters, not late fall quarter, to be the most propitious time for scheduling rush week. It is also apparent from these data that a contrary point of view is adopted by fraternity and sorority leaders. Their opposition expresses itself in two ways: (1) being against change, per se, and (2) tacitly rejecting deferred rushing through the advocacy of a program of early rushing. For the Interfraternity Council, the opposition primarily takes the form of rejecting the proposal to modify current arrangements, with 58 per cent considering such a proposal to be a poor or very poor idea. There is, in addition, another eight per cent who advocate a system of early rush, so that the total opposition in the IFC amounts to two thirds of the overall membership. For the Panhellenic Council, the opposition to deferred rushing is even more extensive. Nine out of ten members one way or the other align themselves against this proposal. But the pattern of opposition is just the reverse of that found above. Fifty-five per cent of the Panhellenic Council favor holding rush prior to New Student Week as against changing to a system of deferred rushing, while 34 per cent of the members are against introducing any change whatsoever in the present system.

The reasons offered against changing the time of rush week vary considerably and, in some cases, constitute only a restatement of the fact the student is against change. Nevertheless, as with the freshmen, a recurrent theme found in the reasons cited by fraternity and sorority leaders is their concern about the disrupting effect deferred rushing might have on their academic pursuits and other college activities. Mention is made of this by 30 per cent of the Interfraternity Council and 55 per cent of the Panhellenic Council opposing change.

Another matter of concern for these students is the threat they consider deferred rushing poses for the Greek system. Reference to such a threat is made by 33 per cent of the Interfraternity Council but by only five per cent of the Panhellenic Council. It is their argument that deferred rushing would: (1) increase the incidence of "dirty rushing," (2) put houses in an unstable financial position because of the lack of dues from freshman pledges, and (3) add considerably to the time and work demanded of the members, themselves--partially because of the burden of continuous rushing and partially because members would have to perform many of the tasks around the houses now undertaken by the pledges.

Another argument put forth by some members of the Interfraternity Council is that many benefits accrue to freshmen from early rushing. Fraternities, they maintain, help indoctrinate the incoming freshman into school life, train them how to study, and, in general, orient the freshmen to the social and intellectual demands that will be made of them in college.

TABLE 9. REACTION OF UNDERGRADUATE OPINION LEADERS TO PROPOSAL TO CHANGE TIME OF RUSHING

Sample Component	N	Per Cent Responding: Very Good	Good	Poor	Very Poor	Don't Care	Don't Know or No Answer
ASUO Senate	51	41	29	10	12	06	02
Dorm Counselors: Male	24	54	25	00	08	12	00
Dorm Counselors: Female	31	52	26	06	03	09	03
Interfraternity Council	69	22	19	23	35	01	00
Panhellenic Council	58	34	26	12	22	04	02

TABLE 10. REACTION OF UNDERGRADUATE OPINION LEADERS TO PROPOSAL TO CHANGE TIME OF RUSHING, WITH APATHETIC STUDENTS EXCLUDED FROM ANALYSIS[a]

Sample Component	N	Per Cent Responding: Very Good	Good + Very Good	Plurality[a]
ASUO Senate	47	45	77	Pro: 3.3/1
Dorm Counselors: Male	21	62	90	Pro: 9.5/1
Dorm Counselors: Female	27	59	89	Pro: 8.0/1
Interfraternity Council	68	22	41	Con: 1.4/1
Panhellenic Council	55	36	64	Pro: 1.8/1

[a]For the analysis in this table students who gave no answer or a "don't know" response have been excluded as well as those giving a "don't care" response.

[b]Plurality is defined as the ratio of majority opinion to minority opinion found among students taking a definite stand on an issue.

TABLE 11. COMPARISON OF TIMES FOR SCHEDULING RUSHING PROPOSED BY UNDERGRADUATE OPINION LEADERS IN FAVOR OF CHANGING RUSHING ARRANGEMENTS

(Reported in Percentages)

Sample Component	N	Period Proposed for Rushing					
		Before New Student Week	Later in Fall Quarter	Winter Quarter	Spring Quarter	Other Time	No Answer or Don't Know
ASUO Senate	36	08	14	53	22	03	00
Dorm Counselors: Male	18	00	17	56	28	00	00
Dorm Counselors: Female	24	12	12	38	33	04	00
Interfraternity Council	28	21	39	29	04	07	00
Panhellenic Council	35	91	06	00	03	00	00

These benefits, the Interfraternity Council members feel, would be lost if rushing were to be scheduled in the spring.

It is also of interest to note that 45 per cent of the Panhellenic Council, who are against any form of change in rushing regulations, stress directly or indirectly their opposition to holding rush during the summer. Here, their concern is not only with the problems they perceive to inhere in managing summer rush but also the disruption such a program would cause in the members' summer vacations or their summer work plans.

REACTION OF UNIVERSITY-CONNECTED ADULTS

Tables 12-14 present the opinions of University-connected adults on the proposal to change the time of rushing. The results show that the division of opinion on this issue is similar to that found among the students. The moderate, but significant, plurality of Moms and Dads Clubs officers and alumni leaders favoring a program of deferred rushing indicates that such a program, if introduced, is likely to be accepted by most adults connected with the University. Nevertheless, a negative reaction to deferred rushing can be expected from both fraternity and sorority chapter advisers. The chapter advisers' reactions parallel to a large degree the reactions of the fraternity and sorority leaders described above. The opposition of the fraternity chapter advisers takes the form of being against any modification of present regulations, while the opposition of the sorority chapter advisers is primarily found in their support of a program of early rushing.

TABLE 12. REACTION OF UNIVERSITY-CONNECTED ADULTS TO PROPOSAL TO CHANGE TIME OF RUSHING

Sample Component	N	Per Cent Responding: Very Good	Good	Poor	Very Poor	Don't Care	Don't Know or No Answer
Officers of Dads Club	37	43	24	05	16	03	08
Officers of Mothers Club	50	60	20	08	06	06	00
Alumni Sample	30	43	07	17	07	13	13
Fraternity Chapter Advisers	11	27	00	09	64	00	00
Sorority Chapter Advisers	15	33	27	20	13	00	07

TABLE 13. REACTION OF UNIVERSITY-CONNECTED ADULTS TO PROPOSAL TO CHANGE TIME OF RUSHING, WITH APATHETIC ADULTS EXCLUDED FROM ANALYSIS[a]

Sample Component	N	Per Cent Responding: Very Good	Good + Very Good	Plurality[b]
Officers of Dads Club	33	48	76	Pro: 3.1/1
Officers of Mothers Club	47	64	85	Pro: 5.7/1
Alumni Sample	22	59	68	Pro: 2.1/1
Fraternity Chapter Advisers	11	27	27	Con: 2.7/1
Sorority Chapter Advisers	14	36	64	Pro: 1.8/1

[a]For the analysis in this table adults who gave no answer or a "don't know" response have been excluded as well as those giving a "don't care" response.

[b]Plurality is defined as the ratio of majority opinion to minority opinion found among students taking a definite stand on an issue.

TABLE 14. COMPARISON OF TIMES FOR SCHEDULING RUSHING PROPOSED BY UNIVERSITY-CONNECTED ADULTS IN FAVOR OF CHANGING RUSHING ARRANGEMENTS

(Reported in Percentages)

Sample Component	N	Period Proposed for Rushing					
		Before New Student Week	Later in Fall Quarter	Winter Quarter	Spring Quarter	Other Time	No Answer or Don't Know
Officers of Dads Club	25	08	12	48	32	00	00
Officers of Mothers Club	40	18	10	32	28	05	08
Alumni Sample	15	07	33	27	13	07	13
Fraternity Chapter Advisers	3	00	33	33	33	00	00
Sorority Chapter Advisers	9	89	11	00	00	00	00

APPENDIX 1. COPY OF QUESTIONNAIRE USED

Campus Issues

There has been some discussion of introducing a number of changes on campus. Read each of the following carefully and indicate whether you think the proposed changes would be:

A VERY GOOD IDEA
A GOOD IDEA
A POOR IDEA
A VERY POOR IDEA
DON'T CARE ONE WAY OR THE OTHER

(Please circle your answers)

	Very Good Idea	*Good Idea*	*Poor Idea*	*Very Poor Idea*	*Don't Care*
Having the university and city jointly build a new auditorium	VG	G	P	VP	DC
Raising admission standards for incoming freshmen	VG	G	P	VP	DC
Modifying university policy so as to prevent avowed Communists from using the campus as a public forum	VG	G	P	VP	DC
Expanding the size of the Honors College so that more students can participate	VG	G	P	VP	DC
Increasing parking fees from the present rate of $5 a year so as to provide more parking space	VG	G	P	VP	DC

IF VERY GOOD or GOOD, answer question 53.

What do you consider a fair yearly rate for parking? $ _____ per year.

Using present student activity fees to finance a new and larger football stadium	VG	G	P	VP	DC
Changing the academic year to 4 full quarters so that a person could graduate in 3 years	VG	G	P	VP	DC

If a full 4-quarter system were established, would you attend college all 4 quarters? (check one)

☐ YES ☐ NO

Changing fraternity and sorority rushing from New Student Week to another time	VG	G	P	VP	DC

IF VERY GOOD or GOOD, answer question 57.

At what time in the academic year should rushing be held?

(Check One)

☐ During the summer before college begins
☐ Later in the Fall Quarter
☐ The Winter Quarter
☐ The Spring Quarter
☐ Some other time (please specify) _____

IF POOR or VERY POOR, answer question 58.

Why do you think so? _____

Changing from a quarter system to a semester system	VG	G	P	VP	DC

R-4-1

(Fall 1962 basic report)

STATISTICAL SUPPLEMENT TO REPORT ON CAMPUS REACTION TO PROPOSED CHANGE IN THE TIME OF FRATERNITY-SORORITY RUSHING:

A REPORT BY THE STUDENT PLANNING STAFF FOR THE UNIVERSITY OF OREGON OFFICE OF STUDENT AFFAIRS

by

Robert A. Ellis and John P. Koval

November 1962

STATISTICAL SUPPLEMENT TO REPORT ON CAMPUS REACTION TO
PROPOSED CHANGE IN THE TIME OF FRATERNITY-SORORITY RUSHING

As noted in the main text of the report, there are eight issues other than the time of rushing on which data have been collected. This supplement presents the results obtained on the auxiliary issues. As has been our practice, two summary tables have been prepared on each particular issue: one giving the actual distribution of answers to the issue and the second, the distribution of answers obtained when the apathetic responses (and no answers) are excluded from analysis. (See Table 1-B.) In addition, so as to provide some measure of the relative strength of the reaction to any particular issue, the pluralities obtained for the nine issues are compared for each sample component. (See Tables 2-11)

Briefly, the results may be summarized as follows:

1. Auditorium. Despite some apathy on the part of freshmen, the proposal to have "the University and city jointly build a new auditorium" received widespread support from all sectors. That opposition which is found to the proposal is largely concentrated among University-connected adults, where, with the exception of sorority chapter advisers, one fourth of the sample components consider such a joint effort to be a poor or very poor idea.

2. Admissions Standards. This is an issue on which most persons have an opinion and are willing to express it. Strong support for "raising admissions standards for incoming freshmen" comes from all components of undergraduate opinion leaders and from freshmen in the Honors College. The reaction of freshmen in general is far more lukewarm, particularly among the males, even though the majority do favor taking this step. Among adults connected with the University the proposal is given a mixed reception. Alumni leaders strongly endorse the move--the plurality obtained being one of the largest given by this group. Quite a different reaction is recorded for the officers of the Mothers Club, 50 per cent of whom are opposed to increasing admissions standards. The reactions of the other components of adults fall in between these two extremes, ranging from fire to lukewarm support for the proposal.

3. Academic Freedom. There is no doubt that the Gus Hall incident made a deep impression on campus. Without exception, the students unequivocally oppose the proposal to curb academic freedom at the University of Oregon and, in doing so, evidence their strong backing of the stand taken by President Fleming. It is also noteworthy that the most one-sided pluralities supporting the policy of academic freedom came from the two sectors of the student body where one would expect the closest identification with the academic values of the institution: namely, the Honors College and the dormitory counselors. It is also apparent that the views of the students are not shared by adults connected with the University. The adults tend to be evenly split in their opinions on this issue, with the majority sentiment favoring a modification in University policy "so as to prevent avowed Communists from using the campus as a public

[illegible] Even where presumably students and adults come into direct contact with one another, as is the case with fraternity and sorority leaders and their chapter advisers, the same fundamental cleavage in opinion is found.

4. Size of the Honors College. The reaction to the proposal to expand the size of the Honors College offers good, although indirect, evidence of the favorable reception given this experimental program by the University community at large. The main opposition to the proposal comes from those already participating in the program. Anticipating, it would seem, their desire to conserve the features of a program that they presently view as beneficial. Otherwise, the general mood is that expansion of the Honors College is a good or very good idea. Significantly, it is the alumni leaders and officers of the Alumni Association who are the strongest advocates of this proposal.

5. Parking Fees. This is an issue on which there is little crystallization of campus opinion. At all levels, there is a sizeable number of people who report not caring about whether parking fees are instituted. Even when the apathetic respondents are excluded from the analysis, we find no consistent position being taken by either students or faculty and with the exception of fraternity chapter advisers and student leaders, the pluralities mustered are small and indecisive.

6. Football Stadium. The findings on this issue corroborate previous reports that the University community is evenly divided in their position to the proposal to construct a new and larger football stadium with the issue of increasing parking fees. No consistent pattern of approval or disapproval is found and, with but one or two exceptions, the pluralities are small and indecisive.

7. Intercollegiate Studies. The proposal to establish a "Intercollegiate Studies" program received a more favorable reaction on campus. Generally, the proposal is more favored by adults than by students and by female students than by male students. The reason for this is that while many students, particularly males, praise the merits of such an acceleration program, they feel they cannot afford to forego the salary for their college education that such study the summer.

8. Parking Permit. The reactions to this issue is almost identical. There is neither opposition to a parking permit being introduced at the University of Oregon, the preferences of all subgroups, without exception, being for continuation of the present parking system.

TABLE 1. REACTION OF UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY TO PROPOSAL TO HAVE THE UNIVERSITY AND CITY JOINTLY BUILD A NEW AUDITORIUM

Sample Component	N	Per Cent Responding: Very Good	Good	Poor	Very Poor	Don't Care	Don't Know or No Answer
FRESHMEN							
Random Sample: Males	156	30	38	10	04	17	01
Random Sample: Females	180	34	34	11	02	18	01
Honors College: Males	66	32	42	05	01	20	00
Honors College: Females	74	39	36	03	05	16	00
UNDERGRADUATE OPINION LEADERS							
ASUO Senate	51	37	35	06	02	00	00
Dormitory Counselors: Male	24	58	25	04	08	00	04
Dormitory Counselors: Female	31	65	29	06	00	00	00
Interfraternity Council	69	43	32	09	07	04	04
Panhellenic Council	38	36	45	10	02	05	02
UNIVERSITY-CONNECTED ADULTS							
Officers of Dads Club	37	30	38	16	08	00	08
Officers of Mothers Club	50	42	24	16	10	06	02
Alumni Sample	30	40	20	23	03	07	07
Fraternity Chapter Advisors	11	55	09	09	27	00	00
Sorority Chapter Advisors	15	27	53	00	00	00	20

TABLE 1a. REACTION OF UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY TO PROPOSAL TO HAVE THE UNIVERSITY AND CITY JOINTLY BUILD A NEW AUDITORIUM, WITH APATHETIC RESPONDENTS EXCLUDED FROM ANALYSIS[a]

Sample Component	N	Per Cent Responding: Very Good	Per Cent Responding: Good + Very Good	Plurality[b]
FRESHMEN				
Random Sample: Males	128	37	83	Pro: 4.8/1
Random Sample: Females	147	42	84	Pro: 5.4/1
Honors College: Males	53	40	92	Pro: 12.2/1
Honors College: Females	62	48	90	Pro: 9.3/1
UNDERGRADUATE OPINION LEADERS				
SGA Senate	51	37	92	Pro: 11.8/1
Dormitory Counselors: Male	23	61	87	Pro: 6.7/1
Dormitory Counselors: Female	31	65	94	Pro: 14.5/1
Interfraternity Council	63	48	83	Pro: 4.7/1
Panhellenic Council	54	39	87	Pro: 6.7/1
UNIVERSITY-CONNECTED ADULTS				
Officers of Dads Club	34	32	74	Pro: 2.9/1
Officers of Mothers Club	46	45	72	Pro: 2.5/1
Alumni Sample	26	46	69	Pro: 2.2/1
Fraternity Chapter Advisers	11	55	64	Pro: 1.8/1
Sorority Chapter Advisers	12	33	100	Pro: 12.0/0

[a]For the analysis in this table respondents who gave no answer or a "don't know" response have been excluded as well as those giving a "don't care" response.

[b]Plurality is defined as the ratio of majority opinion to minority opinion found among respondents taking a definite stand on an issue.

TABLE 2. REACTION OF UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY TO PROPOSAL TO RAISE ADMISSION STANDARDS FOR INCOMING FRESHMEN

Sample Component	N	Per Cent Responding					
		Very Good	Good	Poor	Very Poor	Don't Care	Don't Know or No Answer
FRESHMEN							
Random Sample: Males	156	16	45	24	08	06	01
Random Sample: Females	180	31	32	22	10	06	00
Honors College: Males	66	32	53	05	03	08	00
Honors College: Females	74	49	36	08	03	04	00
UNDERGRADUATE OPINION LEADERS							
ASUO Senate	51	49	29	10	10	02	00
Dormitory Counselors: Male	24	38	58	04	00	00	00
Dormitory Counselors: Female	31	42	45	06	06	00	00
Interfraternity Council	69	41	46	09	04	00	00
Panhellenic Council	58	59	33	07	00	02	00
UNIVERSITY-CONNECTED ADULTS							
Officers of Dads Club	37	49	30	11	05	00	05
Officers of Mothers Club	50	22	28	36	14	00	00
Alumni Sample	30	50	30	07	07	03	03
Fraternity Chapter Advisers	11	18	45	18	18	00	00
Sorority Chapter Advisers	15	47	33	20	00	00	00

TABLE 2a. REACTION OF UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY TO PROPOSAL TO RAISE ADMISSION STANDARDS FOR INCOMING FRESHMEN, WITH APATHETIC RESPONDENTS EXCLUDED FROM ANALYSIS[a]

Sample Component	N	Per Cent Responding: Very Good	Per Cent Responding: Good + Very Good	Plurality[b]
FRESHMEN				
Random Sample: Males	146	37	85	Pro: 1 9/1
Random Sample: Females	170	33	66	Pro: 2 0/1
Honors College: Males	61	34	92	Pro: 11 2/1
Honors College: Females	71	51	89	Pro: 7 9/1
UNDERGRADUATE OPINION LEADERS				
ASUO Senate	50	50	80	Pro: 4 0/1
Dormitory Counselors: Male	24	38	96	Pro: 23 0/1
Dormitory Counselors: Female	31	42	87	Pro: 6 8/1
Interfraternity Council	69	41	87	Pro: 6.7/1
Panhellenic Council	57	60	93	Pro: 13.2/1
UNIVERSITY-CONNECTED ADULTS				
Officers of Dads Club	35	51	83	Pro: 4 8/1
Officers of Mothers Club	50	22	50	Even: 1.0/1
Alumni Sample	28	54	86	Pro: 6 0/1
Fraternity Chapter Advisers	11	18	64	Pro: 1.8/1
Sorority Chapter Advisers	15	47	80	Pro: 4.0/1

[a]For the analysis in this table respondents who gave no answer or a "don't know" response have been excluded as well as those giving a "don't care" response.

[b]Plurality is defined as the ratio of majority opinion to minority opinion found among respondents taking a definite stand on an issue.

TABLE 3. REACTION OF UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY TO PROPOSAL TO MODIFY UNIVERSITY POLICY SO AS TO PREVENT AVOWED COMMUNISTS FROM USING THE CAMPUS AS A PUBLIC FORUM

Sample Component	N	Per Cent Responding					
		Very Good	Good	Poor	Very Poor	Don't Care	Don't Know or No Answer
FRESHMEN							
Random Sample: Males	156	06	07	29	47	11	00
Random Sample: Females	180	03	08	34	51	03	00
Honors College: Males	66	00	02	26	67	05	01
Honors College: Females	74	01	00	26	72	01	00
UNDERGRADUATE OPINION LEADERS							
ASUO Senate	51	00	08	27	61	04	00
Dormitory Counselors: Male	24	00	00	46	54	00	00
Dormitory Counselors: Female	31	00	03	48	45	00	03
Interfraternity Council	69	03	03	39	54	01	00
Panhellenic Council	58	05	07	41	38	07	02
UNIVERSITY-CONNECTED ADULTS							
Officers of Dads Club	37	51	08	14	24	00	03
Officers of Mothers Club	50	34	18	16	26	02	04
Alumni Sample	30	30	03	23	40	00	03
Fraternity Chapter Advisers	11	36	18	18	27	00	00
Sorority Chapter Advisers	15	33	27	40	00	00	00

TABLE 5.1 REACTION OF UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY TO PROPOSAL TO MODIFY UNIVERSITY POLICY SO AS TO PREVENT AVOWED COMMUNISTS FROM USING THE CAMPUS AS A PUBLIC FORUM, WITH APATHETIC RESPONDENTS EXCLUDED FROM ANALYSIS[a]

Sample Component	N	Per Cent Responding Very Good	Per Cent Responding Good + Very Good	Plurality[b]
FRESHMEN				
Random Sample: Males	140	07	15	Con: 5 7/1
Random Sample: Females	174	03	12	Con: 7 3/1
Honors College: Males	62	00	02	Con: 61.0/1
Honors College: Females	73	01	01	Con: 72.0/1
UNDERGRADUATE OPINION LEADERS				
ASUI Senate	49	00	08	Con: 11 2/1
Dormitory Counselors: Male	24	00	00	Con: 24.0/0
Dormitory Counselors: Female	30	00	03	Con: 29 0/1
Interfraternity Council	68	03	06	Con: 16.0/1
Panhellenic Council	53	06	15	Con: 6.0/1
UNIVERSITY-CONNECTED ADULTS				
Officers of Dads Club	36	53	61	Pro: 1 6/1
Officers of Mothers Club	47	36	55	Pro: 1 2/1
Alumni Sample	29	31	34	Con: 1 9/1
Fraternity Chapter Advisers	11	36	55	Pro: 1.2/1
Sorority Chapter Advisers	15	33	60	Pro: 1.5/1

[a]For the analysis in this table respondents who gave no answer or a "don't know" response have been excluded as well as those giving a "don't care" response.

[b]Plurality is defined as the ratio of majority opinion to minority opinion among respondents taking a definite stand on an issue.

TABLE 4. REACTION OF UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY TO PROPOSAL TO EXPAND THE SIZE OF THE HONORS COLLEGE SO THAT MORE STUDENTS CAN PARTICIPATE

Sample Component	N	Per Cent Responding					
		Very Good	Good	Poor	Very Poor	Don't Care	Don't Know or No Answer
FRESHMEN							
Random Sample: Males	156	22	37	14	01	25	01
Random Sample: Females	180	24	35	13	06	21	01
Honors College: Males	66	17	20	36	17	11	00
Honors College: Females	74	20	23	34	14	08	01
UNDERGRADUATE OPINION LEADERS							
ASUO Senate	51	33	33	25	02	02	02
Dormitory Counselors: Male	24	25	50	12	08	04	00
Dormitory Counselors: Female	31	35	52	09	03	00	00
Interfraternity Council	69	26	42	16	01	12	03
Panhellenic Council	58	33	43	19	02	00	04
UNIVERSITY-CONNECTED ADULTS							
Officers of Dads Club	37	43	32	05	03	03	11
Officers of Mothers Club	50	46	36	06	06	02	04
Alumni Sample	30	60	17	07	00	10	07
Fraternity Chapter Advisers	11	55	18	27	00	00	00
Sorority Chapter Advisers	15	47	20	07	00	13	13

TABLE 4a. REACTION OF UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY TO PROPOSAL TO EXPAND THE SIZE OF THE HONORS COLLEGE SO THAT MORE STUDENTS CAN PARTICIPATE, WITH APATHETIC RESPONDENTS EXCLUDED FROM ANALYSIS[a]

Sample Component	N	Per Cent Responding: Very Good	Per Cent Responding: Good + Very Good	Plurality[b]
FRESHMEN				
Random Sample: Males	116	30	79	Pro: 3.8/1
Random Sample: Females	140	31	76	Pro: 3.1/1
Honors College: Males	59	19	41	Con: 1.4/1
Honors College: Females	67	22	48	Con: 1.1/1
UNDERGRADUATE OPINION LEADERS				
ASUO Senate	49	35	71	Pro: 2.5/1
Dormitory Counselors: Male	23	26	78	Pro: 3.6/1
Dormitory Counselors: Female	31	35	87	Pro: 6.6/1
Interfraternity Council	59	30	80	Pro: 3.9/1
Panhellenic Council	56	34	79	Pro: 3.7/1
UNIVERSITY-CONNECTED ADULTS				
Officers of Dads Club	32	50	83	Pro: 7.0/1
Officers of Mothers Club	47	49	87	Pro: 6.8/1
Alumni Sample	25	72	92	Pro: 11.5/1
Fraternity Chapter Advisers	11	55	73	Pro: 2.7/1
Sorority Chapter Advisers	13	54	77	Pro: 3.0/1

[a] For the analysis in this table respondents who gave no answer or a "don't know" response have been excluded as well as those giving a "don't care" response.

[b] Plurality is defined as the ratio of majority opinion to minority opinion found among respondents taking a definite stand on an issue.

TABLE 3. REACTION OF UNIVERSITY CONSULTANT TO PROPOSAL TO INCREASE PARKING FEES FROM THE PRESENT RATE OF $5 A YEAR SO AS TO PROVIDE MORE PARKING SPACE

Sample Component	N	Per Cent Responding: Very Good	Good	Fair	Very Poor	Don't Care	Don't Know or No Answer
FRESHMEN							
Random Sample: Males	156	08	22	17	18	35	00
Random Sample: Females	180	12	17	18	08	44	00
Honors College: Males	66	11	23	12	09	45	00
Honors College: Females	74	12	14	08	12	54	00
UNDERGRADUATE OPINION LEADERS							
ASUO Senate	51	10	18	33	24	10	04
Dormitory Counselors: Male	24	21	25	29	17	08	00
Dormitory Counselors: Female	31	10	16	32	10	26	06
Interfraternity Council	69	12	30	23	19	15	01
Panhellenic Council	58	10	34	26	14	12	04
UNIVERSITY-CONNECTED ADULTS							
Officers of Dads Club	37	32	24	14	14	11	05
Officers of Mothers Club	50	30	22	18	14	12	04
Alumni Sample	30	40	17	03	10	23	07
Fraternity Chapter Advisers	11	73	18	09	00	00	00
Sorority Chapter Advisers	15	13	20	13	33	20	00

TABLE 3A: RELATIVE DEGREE OF UNIVERSITY CONFORMITY TO INDICATE IN DECREASE MARKING FROM THE PLURALITY RULE OF 50 + PLUS 50 AS TO PROVIDE SOME TA-KING LATUDE, WITH STATISTIC EXPECTANCIES EXCLUDED FROM CONSIDERATION[a]

Sample Component	N	Per Cent Acceptance: Very Good	Good + Very Good	Plurality[b]
PRESIDENCY				
Student Sample: Males	101	12	47	Con: 2.1/1
Student Sample: Females	100	12	58	Pro: 1.1/1
Future College: Males	36	19	61	Pro: 1.6/1
Future College: Females	34	26	56	Pro: 1.3/1
NON-GRADUATE OPINION LEADERS				
AIIC Senate	43	12	33	Con: 2.1/1
Dormitory Counselors: Male	22	23	50	Even: 1.0/1
Dormitory Counselors: Female	21	14	38	Con: 1.6/1
Interfraternity Council	33	15	33	Pro: 1.1/1
Panhellenic Council	49	12	53	Pro: 1.1/1
UNIVERSITY-CONNECTED ADULTS				
Officers of Dude Club	31	39	68	Pro: 2.1/1
Officers of Quthers Club	42	36	62	Pro: 1.6/1
Alumni Sample	21	37	81	Pro: 4.3/1
Fraternity Chapter Advisers	11	73	91	Pro: 10.0/1
Sorority Chapter Advisers	12	17	42	Con: 1.2/1

[a]For the analyses in this table respondents who gave no answer or a "don't know" response have been excluded as well as those giving a "don't care" response.

[b]Plurality is defined as the ratio of majority opinion to minority opinion found among respondents taking a definite stand on an issue.

TABLE 6. RELATION OF UNIVERSITY COURSES TO PREPARING ST
OUR PRESENT STUDENT ACTIVITY FOR [illegible]
A [illegible] AND LIBERAL [illegible]

Sample Component	N	Per Cent Responding					
		Very Good	Good	Fair	Very Poor	Don't Know	[illegible]
FRESHMEN							
Random Sample: Males	156	21	39	27	11	02	01
Random Sample: Females	180	13	38	36	10	11	03
Honors College: Males	46	09	21	30	17	14	04
Honors College: Females	74	04	13	32	30	18	04
UNDERGRADUATE OFFICE LEADERS							
ASUO Senate	51	16	37	24	18	02	04
Dormitory Counselors: Male	24	17	46	21	17	00	04
Dormitory Counselors: Female	31	13	29	35	19	03	04
Interfraternity Council	49	16	41	26	06	03	08
Panhellenic Council	38	17	41	17	13	09	04
UNIVERSITY-CONNECTED ADULTS							
Officers of Dads Club	37	16	24	24	16	03	14
Officers of Mothers Club	30	18	24	24	12	06	12
Alumni Couple	30	50	17	07	17	03	07
Fraternity Chapter Advisors	11	36	18	27	09	09	00
Sorority Chapter Advisors	15	40	40	13	00	07	00

Sample Comparison	N	Party Level	Party Unity	Unanimity[a]
Policies				
Higher Income Police	141	43	41	Over 1.5/1
Higher Income Citizens	314	15	13	Over 1.5/1
Lower College Police	55	50	54	Over 1.5/1
Lower College Citizens	58	96	54	Over 2.5/1
Task-Oriented Office Users				
All Males	49	17	13	Over 1.5/1
Formerly Connected Male	24	17	13	Over 1.5/1
Formerly Connected Female	22	13	45	Over 1.5/1
Attractively Housed	51	41	39	Over 2.5/1
Unattractive Housed	33	20	17	Over 1.5/1
Activity-Oriented Group				
Officers of Club	30	23	33	Over 1.5/1
Officers of Fathers Club	35	23	34	Over 1.5/1
Lower Income	27	56	74	Over 2.5/1
Fraternity Chapter Advisors	20	90	60	Over 1.5/1
Sorority Chapter Advisors	18	50	89	Over 1.5/1

[a]For the purpose in this table respondents who gave no answer or a "don't know" answer have been included as well as those giving a "don't recall" response.

[b]Unanimity is defined as the ratio of majority opinion to minority opinion (majority representing taking a definite stand on an issue.

TABLE 7. REACTION OF HOSPITALITY COMMUNITY TO PROPOSAL TO
BUILD THE SCHENLEY PLAZA TO PROVIDE FULL CHARTERS AS
THAT A PROJECT COULD ORIGINATE IN THOSE TERMS

Single Component	N	Per Cent Responding: Very Good	Good	Poor	Very Poor	Don't Care	Don't Know or No Answer
TOTALS							
Sample Sample: Males	154	21	19	32	22	15	13
Sample Sample: Females	130	25	27	25	21	12	20
Income Category: Males	68	06	32	23	14	20	21
Income Category: Females	74	30	30	15	03	09	20
OCCUPATIONAL GROUP MEANS							
Self Female	51	37	05	12	02	02	11
Secretary Caseworker: Male	34	29	32	17	08	04	06
Secretary Caseworker: Female	31	16	29	22	07	03	23
Professional Council	08	32	26	32	12	07	04
Professional Council	38	18	34	15	10	03	21
RELIGIOUS-ORIENTED GROUPS							
Officers of Fish Club	37	41	30	08	16	03	02
Officers of Culture Club	34	30	24	28	05	02	11
Church Couple	42	38	17	10	07	05	17
Protestant Church Members	14	28	21	08	00	04	30
Parochial Church Members	15	47	40	00	04	00	13

TABLE 7a. REACTION OF UNIVERSITY CONSTITUTENTS TO PROPOSAL TO
GRADUATE THE ACADEMIC YEAR IN FOUR FULL QUARTERS
SO THAT A STUDENT COULD GRADUATE IN THREE YEARS,
WITH APPROPRIATE ADJUSTMENTS MADE FOR ATHLETICS[a]

Sample Component	N	Per Cent Responding Very Good	Per Cent Responding Good + Very Good	Plurality[b]
FRESHMEN				
Random Sample: Males	131	13	36	Cons 1 0/1
Random Sample: Females	158	28	59	Pro 1 4/1
Honors College: Males	52	04	48	Cons 1.1/1
Honors College: Females	67	40	73	Pro 2 7/1
UNDERGRADUATE OPINION LEADERS				
ASUO Senate	49	39	80	Pro 4 0/1
Judiciary Council: Male	23	30	74	Pro 2 0/1
Judiciary Commissioner: Female	30	27	77	Pro 1 7/1
Interfraternity Council	53	24	57	Pro 1.3/1
Panhellenic Council	35	34	72	Pro 2 1/1
UNIVERSITY-CONNECTED ADULTS				
Officers of Duck Club	35	43	94	Pro 7 0/1
Officers of Ducks Club	47	36	83	Pro 4 0/1
Alumni Sample	27	63	81	Pro 4 1/1
Fraternity Chapter Advisers	10	70	90	Pro 9 1/1
Sorority Chapter Advisers	13	54	100	Pro 13.0/1

[a] For the analysis in this table respondents who gave no answer or a "don't know" response have been excluded as well as those giving a "don't care" response.

[b] Plurality is defined as the ratio of majority opinion to minority opinion (those responding having a definite stand on an issue).

TABLE 8. REACTION OF UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY TO PROPOSAL TO CHANGE FROM A QUARTER SYSTEM TO A SEMESTER SYSTEM

Sample Component	N	Per Cent Responding: Very Good	Good	Poor	Very Poor	Don't Care	Don't Know or No Answer
FACULTY							
Random Sample: Males	156	09	06	26	49	13	01
Random Sample: Females	180	05	04	29	53	05	01
Coeducational College: Males	66	03	05	33	44	13	00
Women's College: Females	74	00	05	39	47	08	01
UNDERGRADUATE OPINION LEADERS							
ASUO Senate	51	14	02	33	43	00	08
Dormitory Counselors: Male	24	12	17	33	29	08	00
Dormitory Counselors: Female	31	03	03	39	48	06	00
Interfraternity Council	69	36	07	14	70	00	02
Panhellenic Council	58	17	05	33	32	00	03
UNIVERSITY-CONNECTED ADULTS							
Officers of Duck Club	37	03	03	34	41	14	03
Officers of Mothers Club	50	02	06	43	33	06	10
Alumni Trustee	30	13	03	30	23	20	13
Fraternity Chapter Advisors	11	18	00	36	36	09	00
Sorority Chapter Advisors	23	30	00	35	17	07	13

TABLE 3a. REACTION OF UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY TO PROPOSAL TO CHANGE FROM A QUARTER SYSTEM TO A SEMESTER SYSTEM, WITH APATHETIC RESPONDENTS EXCLUDED FROM ANALYSIS[a]

Sample Component	N	Per Cent Responding: Very Good	Per Cent Responding: Good + Very Good	Plurality[b]
FRESHMEN				
Random Sample: Males	134	06	13	Con: 5.9/1
Random Sample: Females	165	06	10	Con: 8.7/1
Honors College: Males	56	04	09	Con: 10.2/1
Honors College: Females	67	03	09	Con: 10.2/1
UNDERGRADUATE OPINION LEADERS				
AWS Senate	42	15	17	Con: 4.2/1
Dormitory Counselors: Male	22	14	32	Con: 2.3/1
Dormitory Counselors: Female	29	03	07	Con: 13.5/1
Interfraternity Council	67	06	15	Con: 6.4/1
Panhellenic Council	56	07	12	Con: 7.0/1
UNIVERSITY-CONNECTED ADULTS				
Officers of Dads Club	26	04	08	Con: 12.0/1
Officers of Mothers Club	41	02	12	Con: 7.2/1
Alumni Sample	20	20	25	Con: 3.0/1
Fraternity Chapter Advisers	10	20	30	Con: 4.0/1
Sorority Chapter Advisers	12	25	25	Con: 3.0/1

[a]For the analysis in this table respondents who gave no answer or a "don't know" response have been excluded as well as those giving a "don't care" response.

[b]Plurality is defined as the ratio of majority opinion to minority opinion found among respondents taking a definite stand on an issue.

TABLE 9. COMPARISON OF PLURALITIES ON NINE SELECTED CAMPUS ISSUES FOR TWO FRESHMAN SAMPLE COMPONENTS

Campus Issue	Freshman Sample		Honors College Sample	
	Plurality (N=336)	Ranking of Plurality	Plurality (N=140)	Ranking of Plurality
Auditorium	Pro: 5.0/1	4	Pro: 10.5/1	2
Admissions Standards	Pro: 1.9/1	6	Pro: 9.2/1	4
Academic Freedom	Con: 6.5/1	2	Con: 66.0/1	1
Size of Honors College	Pro: 3.5/1	5	Con: 1.2/1	9
Parking Fees	Even: 1.0/1	9	Pro: 1.4/1	8
Football Stadium	Pro: 1.5/1	7	Con: 2.1/1	6
Tri-Semester System	Con: 1.1/1	8	Pro: 1.6/1	7
Quarter System	Con: 7.8/1	1	Con: 10.2/1	3
Housing	Pro: 6.2/1	3	Pro: 5.7/1	5

TABLE 10. COMPARISON OF PLURALITIES ON NINE SELECTED CAMPUS ISSUES FOR UNDERGRADUATE OPINION LEADERS

Campus Issue	ASSU Senate		Dorm Counselors		Interfraternity & Panhellenic Councils	
	Plurality (N=51)	Ranking of Plurality	Plurality (N=55)	Ranking of Plurality	Plurality (N=127)	Ranking of Plurality
Auditorium	Pro: 11.8/1	1	Pro: 9.8/1	3	Pro: 5.2/1	4
Admissions Standards	Pro: 4.0/1	6	Pro: 10.0/1	2	Pro: 8.7/1	2
Academic Freedom	Con: 11.2/1	2	Con: 54.0/1	1	Con: 10.0/1	1
Size of Honors College	Pro: 2.5/1	7	Pro: 5.0/1	5	Pro: 3.8/1	5
Parking Fees	Con: 2.1/1	8	Con: 1.3/1	8	Pro: 1.1/1	9
Football Stadium	Pro: 1.4/1	9	Pro: 1.2/1	9	Pro: 3.4/1	6
Mid-Semester Exams	Pro: 6.0/1	3	Pro: 1.8/1	7	Pro: 1.6/1	7.5
Quarter System	Con: 4.7/1	4	Con: 4.7/1	6	Con: 6.7/1	3
Smoking	Pro: 3.3/1	5	Pro: 8.6/1	4	Pro: 1.6/1	7.5

TABLE 13. COMPARISON OF PLURALITIES ON FIVE SELECTED CAMPUS ISSUES FOR UNIVERSITY-CONNECTED GROUPS

Campus Issue	Officers of Women's & Sorority Clubs			Alumni Sample			Fraternity & Sorority Advisors		
	Plurality (N=87)		Ranking of Plurality	Plurality (N=30)		Ranking of Plurality	Plurality (N=26)		Ranking of Plurality
Architecture	Pro:	2.6/1	4	Pro:	4.5/1	3	Pro:	2.2/1	6
Athletics Standards	Pro:	1.7/1	7	Pro:	6.0/1	2	Pro:	2.7/1	5
Academic Freedom	Pro:	1.4/1	8	Con:	1.9/1	9	Pro:	1.4/1	8
Size of Honors College	Pro:	6.9/1	2	Pro:	11.5/1	1	Pro:	3.0/1	3-5
Parking Fees	Pro:	1.8/1	6	Pro:	4.2/1	5	Pro:	2.1/1	7
Football Stadium	Pro:	1.1/1	9	Pro:	2.8/1	7	Pro:	3.0/1	3-5
Multi-Semester System	Pro:	2.4/1	5	Pro:	4.4/1	4	Pro:	22.0/1	1
Quarter System	Con:	8.6/1	1	Con:	3.0/1	6	Con:	3.4/1	2
Bussing	Pro:	4.1/1	3	Pro:	2.2/1	8	Con:	1.1/1	9